

REMARKS

In the 5/11/01 final Office Action, paragraph 1 states that it is the filing papers themselves which contain an incorrect reference to Serial No. 08/845,662. Applicant has again reviewed the application papers filed, and neither the original application or specification, transmittal, Declaration, or Preliminary Amendment include any reference to Serial No. 08/845,662. Accordingly, Applicant understands paragraph 1 of the 5/11/01 final office action to be directed only to the filing receipt which incorrectly references 08/845,662. Consequently, while Applicant has concurrently filed a Request for Corrected Filing Receipt, no other corrections relative to any application papers appear to be needed. The priority claims in the Preliminary Amendment filed with the application are correct.

Claims 56, 57, 62, 64, and 65 are pending, along with newly added claims 66-72.

The Decision on Appeal affirmed the final rejection of claims 56, 57, 62, 64, and 65 as indefinite due to the "similar articles" language, in the Preamble of independent claims 56 and 65. Accordingly, claims 56 and 65 have been amended herein to delete the "similar article" language. Claims 56, 57, 62, 64, and 65 now refer to processing a "semiconductor article." (Reference p. 1, ln. 9.) In view of this change to the Preamble of claims 56 and 65, Applicant submits

that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph final rejection (at paragraph 7 of the 5/11/01 office action) is overcome.

Regarding the objection to the drawings at paragraph 3 of the 5/11/01 final office action, the Decision on Appeal does not directly address this issue (Decision p. 3). However, the corresponding 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph final rejection of claim 65 relating to the "in a second direction, perpendicular to the first direction" language of claim 65 was not sustained. (2/26/03 Decision, pp. 6-8.) Accordingly, Applicant submits that the objection to the drawings at paragraph 3 of the 5/11/01 final Office Action is moot or is overcome.

As the remaining rejections of the appealed claims (56, 57, 62, 64, and 65) were not sustained, Applicant submits that those claims are now in condition for allowance without further examination.

The newly added claims 66-72 are also directed primarily to the embodiment shown in Figures 40-49 and described at pages 52-56. Regarding new claim 66, the docking station is shown at 608 in Figure 40 and described at page 53, Ins. 7-15. The shelf is shown at 609 in Figure 40 and described at page 53, Ins. 9-12).

The spinning and spraying steps described in claims 66, 67, 69, and 70 are described at page 48, Ins. 12-20.

The carrier and receiving receptacles of claim 67, 68, and 71 are shown as element 51 in Figure 40 and described at p. 12, Ins. 6-15.

The carriage and carriage movement described in new claim 70 is shown at element 100 in Figures 40 or 41 and is described at p. 56, Ins. 3-9.

In view of the discussion at pp. 8-10 of the Decision on Appeal concerning the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections, Applicant submits that new claims 66-72 are patentable. Moreover, claims 66-72 are even further patentably distinct over Iwai, because all of these new claims include the steps of spinning and spraying. Since Iwai is a heat treatment apparatus, it does not suggest either of these steps.

A Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: April 25, 2003

Kenneth H. Ohriner
Kenneth H. Ohriner
Registration No. 31,646

Correspondence Address:



Perkins Coie LLP
Patent – LA
P.O. Box 1208
Seattle, WA 98111-1208
Phone: (310) 788-9900
Fax: (310) 788-3399